MSG

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DANON J. DOYLE 16 Catfish Lane, Norristown, PA 19403) Civil Action No.	17	2430
Plaintiff	}		
v.	}		
MERRICK BANK CORP.	}		
10705 S. Jordan Gtwy, Ste 200,	\		
South Jordan, UT 84095	}		
and Does 1-100, inclusive	}		
Defendants	}		

COMPLAINT:

This is an action brought by Plaintiff DANON J. DOYLE for damages, statutory damages, punitive damages, restitution, interest, court costs, and injunctive relief under rights pursuant to Federal Statute 47 U.S.C. 227, and 47 C.F.R. 64 ("Federal Question" Jurisdiction) for the *ultra vires* illegal actions and deliberate and knowing tortious activity of MERRICK BANK CORP. ("Merrick"), and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, in negligently and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff via Plaintiff's telephone to collect a debt or otherwise solicit sales by utilization of an automatic telephone dialing system ("RoboCalls") in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* Plaintiff also brings claims under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), 15 U.S.C. § 1692. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury, and complains and alleges as follows:

I. <u>Introduction</u>

1. Plaintiff brings this action to challenge Merrick's practices in the telephone

solicitation of its products and services, and the means by which it attempts to collect upon its debts. Specifically, Plaintiff challenges Merrick's and Merrick's agents' illegal telephone solicitations and RoboCalls by which it uses to contact consumers who may or may not owe Merrick money, and failure to maintain a Do-Not-Call list.

2. All of the claims asserted herein arise out of Merrick's illegal telephone solicitation and/or debt collection campaign and are a common fact pattern.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), in that Defendant conducts business in, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to plaintiff's claims occurred in, Pennsylvania's Montgomery County, which lies within this judicial district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §118. Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Also, see *Lary V. The Doctors Answer, LLC* CV-12-S-3510-NE (N.D. Ala. March 8, 2013.), a Federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act case, which held that "venue is proper in the district where [plaintiff] resides because the injury did not occur when the facsimile was sent...; it occurred when the [facsimile] was received.

III. Parties

- 5. Plaintiff DANON J. DOYLE ("Plaintiff") is an individual who received the alleged phone calls on his private mobile telephone line, 484-919-3060, mentioned herein.
 Plaintiff is an adult individual residing at 16 Catfish Lane, Norristown, PA 19403.
 - 6. Defendant MERRICK BANK CORP. ("Merrick") is Utah based corporation and is

a financial institution that markets and sells, *inter alia*, a variety of credit cards to consumers throughout the United States. Merrick transacts business in, inter alia, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which lies within this Judicial District. Merrick Bank has a principal place of business located at 10705 S. Jordan Gtwy, Ste 200, South Jordan, UT 84095. Upon information and belief, Merrick Bank may be served via its registered agent, Brian W. Jones, at 10705 S Jordan Gateway #200, South Jordan, UT 84095.

- 7. Except as described herein, Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names of Defendants sued as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and the nature of their wrongful conduct, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
- **8.** At all times herein mentioned, Merrick and the Doe Defendants, (collectively, "Defendants"), and each of them, were an agent or joint venture of each of the other, and in doing the acts alleged herein, were acting within the scope of such agency. Each Defendant had actual and/or constructive knowledge of the acts of each of the other Defendants, and ratified, approved, joined in, acquiesced and/or authorized the wrongful acts of each co-Defendant, and/or retained the benefits of said wrongful acts.
- 9. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants conspired by means of mutual understanding, either expressly or impliedly, among themselves and others in engaging and/or planning to engage in the activities detailed herein to accomplish the wrongful conduct, wrongful goals, and wrongdoing.

IV. Factual Allegations

10. Standing is proper under Article III of the Constitution of the United States of America because Plaintiff's claims state: a.) a valid injury in fact, b.) which is traceable to

the conduct of the defendants, and c.) and is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision. See, Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 578 U.S. ___ (2016) at 6, and Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 at 560. 29."

- 11. Prior to the events giving rise to this lawsuit, Plaintiff's mother, Louisa Butcher, used a mobile telephone number, 484-919-3060. Plaintiff's mother paid for the telephone service through Tracfone, a prepaid telephone service.
 - 12. Plaintiff's mother is currently sixty-five (65) years old.
- 13. Prior to the events giving rise to this lawsuit, Plaintiff's mother was disabled. Plaintiff lived with his mother in order to take care of her health and well-being.
- 14. In September 2016, Plaintiff's mother had a stroke. Since that time, Plaintiff's mother has been hospitalized and has been incapacitated. She was, and remains, unable to speak and/or make legal decisions on her own behalf.
- 15. As Louisa Butcher's guardian, Plaintiff began using the telephone for himself, since his own service had run out of minutes and Plaintiff did not have enough money to purchase another phone or telephone service. Plaintiff purchased additional prepaid minutes for this phone at his own expense.
- 16. Plaintiff does not know the specific credit cards his mother previously used, however, Plaintiff suspects that his mother may have used a credit card issued by Merrick Bank prior to her incapacitation.
- 17. Plaintiff's mother has been unable to pay any of her outstanding bills due to her hospitalization and serious medical condition. Plaintiff's mother received Social Security Disability benefits as her sole source of income.
 - 18. In or about January, 2017, Plaintiff received the first of multiple "RoboCalls" by

Defendants and/or their agents at Plaintiff's personal mobile telephone, 484-919-3060. Plaintiff had not consented to this solicitation.

- 19. The incoming call displayed caller identification showing 1-866-874-0110, and upon answering, Plaintiff heard a pre-recorded message. Plaintiff was ultimately connected with an agent from Merrick Bank.
- **20.** The unsolicited telephone call was placed to Plaintiff's personal mobile telephone number and utilized an "automatic telephone dialing system" or "RoboCall," to transmit a message, as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).
- **21.** The telephone call was a "RoboCall" because there was a delay before an agent answered the phone, and because Plaintiff heard a pre-recorded message.
- 22. Plaintiff pays for each incoming and outgoing call on his telephone under a prepaid minutes arrangement, as defined and set forth in 47 CFR § 64.1200(a)(1)(iii).
- 23. Plaintiff spoke to an agent from Merrick Bank, who informed him that Plaintiff's mother owed Merrick money from a delinquent credit card bill. Plaintiff informed Merrick that his mother had been indefinitely incapacitated and hospitalized with a stroke, and that she was unable to pay.
- 24. Plaintiff was distressed that his mother was receiving debt collection calls, which only further served to remind Plaintiff of her sad and deteriorating condition, causing him great anxiety and emotional upset.
- **25.** Plaintiff informed Merrick that they were calling the wrong number and that they were reaching him, not his mother.
- **26.** Plaintiff demanded that Merrick never call him again, and demanded that Merrick place his number on their Do-Not-Call list.

- 27. Merrick Bank failed to comply with his reasonable request.
- 28. While Plaintiff's mother might have provided the Defendants with her prior express consent to receive calls or RoboCalls, Plaintiff clearly and in plain terms revoked that consent verbally.
- 29. Defendants continued to call Plaintiff's telephone using the same caller identification, 1-866-874-0110. On many occasions, Plaintiff answered the phone to attempt to tell Merrick to stop calling once again, but the call(s) would disconnect prior to him being connected with an agent.
- **30.** On multiple occasions thereafter, Plaintiff called the Defendants back and told them they had the wrong number and to stop calling.
- 31. Plaintiff became very frustrated that these incoming calls were costing him money, since he pays for each minute through Tracfone.
 - 32. Defendants continued to call Plaintiff through May 24, 2017.
- 33. Plaintiff searched his call records and documented at least sixteen (16) calls from Merrick Bank. Plaintiff alleges that he received dozens of additional calls beyond those that he has documented. Plaintiff will seek the leave of the Court to amend his complaint to include additional calls he received from the Defendants, after ascertaining further information and documentation through the discovery process.
- **34.** These telephone solicitations constituted "calls" under the TCPA that were not for emergency purposes.
- 35. Plaintiff did not provide any one, more, or all Defendants, nor any agent of Defendants, prior express written consent, or any other form of consent, express or implied, to cause Plaintiff to receive telephone calls for debt collection or sales purposes on his

personal mobile telephone.

- **36.** Plaintiff had no prior business relationship with any one, more, or all of Defendants.
- 37. The RoboCalls violated various portions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 and 47 CFR § 64.1200.

First Cause of Action

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "Sales Call" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

- **38.** Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **39.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F), and 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F).
- **40.** Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

Second Cause of Action

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA "Sales Call" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

- **41.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **42.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F), and 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2), Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

43. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

Third Cause of Action

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "RoboCall" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

- **44.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above
- **45.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et. seq., Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to the private right of action.

Fourth Cause of Action

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA "RoboCall" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

- **46.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **47.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

Fifth Cause of Action

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "Do-Not-Call List" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

- **48.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **49.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(3), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and

every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

Sixth Cause of Action

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA "Do-Not-Call List" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

- **50.** Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.
- **51.** As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(3) Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as implied, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to the implied private right of action.

Seventh Cause of Action

Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA)

- **52.** Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.
 - 53. Plaintiff is a "consumer" defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3) of the FDCPA.
- **54.** Defendant is a "debt collector" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) of the FDCPA.
- **55.** Any alleged debts at issue arose out of a transaction(s) which were primarily for personal, family or household purposes.
- **56.** Defendant violated the FDCPA. Defendant's violations include, but are not limited to, violations of U.S.C. §§ 1692e(2)(A), 1692e(8), 1692e(10), and 1692f, as evidenced by the following conduct: Deliberately and knowingly harassing Plaintiff in an attempt to coerce him into paying his mother's purported debt(s), despite Plaintiff's demands to Defendant to stop calling.
 - 57. Plaintiff informed Defendant that his mother was sick and incapacitated with a

stroke, but Defendants continued to call.

- **58.** Plaintiff informed Defendants that Louisa Butcher no longer used the telephone number in question, yet Defendants continued to call.
- **59.** Plaintiff informed Defendant that Plaintiff's mother did not have the ability to pay, and that Plaintiff would not pay for his mother's debts. Defendants continued to call.
- **60.** Defendant otherwise used false, deceptive, misleading and unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.
- 61. Defendant's acts as described above were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law and with the purpose of coercing Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff's sick mother to pay monies relating to the debt and any inaccurate information surrounding it.
- **62.** As a result of the above violations of the FDCPA, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff in the sum of Plaintiff's statutory damages, actual damages and attorney's fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

L PRAYER FOR RELIEF

On Causes of Action 1-6:

- 1. For awards of \$500 for each negligent violation as set forth in actions 1-6;
- **2.** For awards of \$1,500 for each knowing and/or willful violation as set forth in actions 1-6.
- Injunctive relief against Defendants, and each of them, to prevent future wrongdoing;

On Cause of Action 7:

- 4. Statutory damages in the amount of \$1,000.
- 5. Actual damages.
- 6. Damages for emotional and mental distress.
- 7. Punitive damages
- 8. Attorney's fees and costs

For All Causes of Action:

- 9. Prejudgment interest at the maximum legal rate;
- 10. Costs of suit herein incurred; and
- 11. All such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

V. <u>Demand for Jury Trial</u>

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable.

Dated: 5/30/2017

Danon J. Doyle Plaintiff Pro Se 16 Catfish Lane Norristown, PA 19403 (484) 919-3060

Danpa21@hotmail.com

Case 2:17-cv-02430-MSG Document 1 Filed 05/30/17 Page 12 of 2 4 3 0

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of in the court of the court for the purpose of in the court of the court for the purpose of in the court for the court for the purpose of in the court for the c

purpose of including	CREC SHOOT. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT TRICE OF THIS FORMAL)	
I. (a) PL DANON J. D. E. 16 CATFISH LANE,	DEF MERRI 10705	
16 CATFISH LANE,	11111	
NORRISTOWN PA 19403	I SOUTH	

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff MONTGOMERY

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) DANON J. DOYLE 16 CATFISH LANE,

NORRISTOWN, PA 19403 PHONE: 484-919-3060

ENDANTS CK BANK CORP S. JORDAN GTWY, STE 200 TH JORDAN, UT 84095

SALT LAKE County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. NOTE:

Attorneys (If Known) Unknown

II. BASIS OF JURISDI	(\mathbf{CTION}) (Place an "X" in (ne Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF I		L PARTIES			
7	≯ 3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only)	PTF DEF		and One Box f	or Defenda PTF	(ant) DEF
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	Not a Party)		71 DEF	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		11 4	1 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	up of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 0 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		D 5	5
	,		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 0 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	1 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	Colors on "V" in One Bon O	-L.\	r oreign Country			******		
CONTRACT		DRTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER.	STATUT	ES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other	☐ 423 With	eal 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157	☐ 375 False C ☐ 376 Qui Tar 3729(a	m (31 US(C
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act	Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers'	O 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability		PROPEI ☐ 820 Copy ☐ 830 Paten		☐ 400 State Ro ☐ 410 Antitrus ☐ 430 Banks a ☐ 450 Comme	st and Bankir	
☐ 151 Medicate Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product	 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 	LABOR	□ 840 Trade	SECURITY	☐ 460 Deports ☐ 470 Rackets Corrupt	ation eer Influen Organiza	tions
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage	TY ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Management Relations ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act	☐ 861 H1A ☐ 862 Black ☐ 863 DIW ☐ 864 SSID ☐ 865 RSI (c Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	☐ 480 Consum ☐ 490 Cable/S ☐ 850 Securiti Exchar ■ 890 Other S	Sat TV ies/Commo nge	odities/
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION	☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation		AL TAX SUITS	891 Agricul 893 Enviror 895 Freedor Act	tural Acts nmental M	latters
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	Income Security Act		s (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 896 Arbitrat	tion	
□ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditions of Confinement	IMMIGRATION. 462 Naturalization Application	or De □ 871 IRS— 26 U	efendant)	□ 899 Admini Act/Rev	strative Pr view or Ap Decision utionality of	opeal of
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) X 1 Original Proceeding State Court								
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 227 U.S.C., et. seq, Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 Brief description of cause:							
	Defendants called	d Plaintiff on his cell	phone in a harassing man					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAND \$		HECK YES only i URY DEMAND:	f demanded in X Yes	complair No	nt:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 05/30/2017		SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY OF RECORD		and the processing of the re-			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY								
RECEIPT# AM	IOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		

Case 2:17-cv-02430 to Brands DISTRICE COSCO Pag 17 of 14 2430

FOR THE STATE IT. TRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of

assignment data production and the second se	
Address of Plaintiff: 16 Catfish Lane, Norristown, PA 19403	
Address of Defendant: 10705 S. Jordan Gtwy, Ste 200, South Jordan, UT 84095	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: By phone call to my private telephone (Use Reverse Side For Accident)	Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)	
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No 🗸
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year.	ear prayically terminated action in this court?
1. Is this case related to property included in an earner numbered suit pending of within one ye	Yes No
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior s	
action in this court?	Yes□ Not
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier r	
terminated action in this court?	Yes No No
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	
	Yes□ No □
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in one category only)	,
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. □ Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. □ Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
8. Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. X All other Federal Question Cases	(Tease specify)
(Please specify) Federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act	
ARBITRATION CERT	IFICATION
I, Danon J. Doyle , counsel of record do hereby certifi	
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and b	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	5
X/	PLAINTIFF PRO SE
DATE: 5/30/2017 Danon J. Doyle,	
Attorney At Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if ther	Attorney I.D.#
110121 11 dial de lleve will de a dial ey july billy it diel	
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	
DATE: 5/30/2017 Danon J. Doyle	PLAINTIFF PRO SE
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DIGRES OF THE PAGE 14 of 14

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

DANON J. DOYLE	:	CIVIL ACTION				
v.	: :					
MERRICK BANK CORP	•	NO.	24			
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.						
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MANA	AGEMENT TRACKS:				
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.						
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)						
(f) Standard Management - Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.						
5/30/2017	Danon J. Doyle	PLAINTIFF PRO SE				
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for				
(484) 919-3060		Danpa21@hotmail.com				
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address				

(Civ. 660) 10/02